

Technical Advisor Project Evaluations 2004



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County Conservation Dist
Project Name: Entiat R. Bridge to Bridge Reach Rest.
Project Number: 04-1503R
Project Location: Entiat River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County PUD
Project Name: Dryden Fish Enhancement CMZ
Project Number: 04-1461R
Project Location: Dryden, Washington
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The sponsor has provided additional information to address the earlier concerns of the Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Given the significant property constraints at this site, it is possible that the proposed approach is the best solution to improving fish habitat.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County
Project Name: Wenatchee Instream Flow Habitat
Project Number: 04-1700N
Project Location: Wenatchee River
Project Type: Non-capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

environmental project. The idea of providing a place for juvenile salmon to rest and feed remains a valid concept but it is essential the habitat provided is healthy and sustainable. Suggest keeping the POC designation unless the costs associated with the fish bench feature are removed, a full and functioning vegetative buffer is provided to support backshore functions, and clarity if provided for the sponsors ability to maintain the site over the long term.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Specific criteria the Technical Advisors used to term this as a project of concern are:

- Information provided, or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
- The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the costs.
- The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
- The stewardship plan is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance of the project and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Jones Shotwell Ditch Board
Project Name: Jones Shotwell Diversion Enhancement
Project Number: 04-1508R
Project Location: Monitor
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

This project involves rebuilding the intake of an existing 600 foot-long diversion ditch, installing a new screen, providing fish passage from the downstream end, and adding LWD in the ditch for habitat purposes. The primary goal of the project seems to be to renovate the aging diversion structure, which happens to be used by juvenile salmonids as rearing habitat. Of the four components of the project, the installation of a new diversion screen will have the most significant benefit. Cost appears to be fairly high for the small amount of habitat gained.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County
Project Name: Peshastin Creek Fish Barrier Removal
Project Number: 04-1509 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The sponsor has provided the additional information requested by the SRFB Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County Natural Resources Program
Project Name: Irwin CMZ Restoration Project
Project Number: 04-1517N
Project Location: Leavenworth
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

The hydrological investigation provided as the applicant’s response detailed excellent information to help further evaluate this project. It is clear that the floodplain area at the project site is at an elevation that is rarely flooded, making it less subject to avulsion from flood flows. However, the fact that the river hasn’t migrated to this area in 40 years is an insufficient time frame with which to evaluate its migration potential. The fact that 1) river gravel underlies a substantial, albeit highly erodible, silt deposit (from the historical dam), 2) the riparian vegetation is sparse in places and unlikely to maintain bank stability across the site, and 3) the site appears to have recognizable swales (potentially old side channels) on this surface (although their age is uncertain) indicate that a potential for future avulsion does exist. The confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River is a particularly dynamic environment. While the current channel position may not be conducive to migration into the project area “because flood forces are directed along the opposite bank,” during higher flows a large quantity of sediment can deposit and potentially cause significant shifts in the thalweg of the river. Your description confirms the site as one of the few “low floodplain areas in aggradation zones.” Finally, the technical advisors are not sure that riparian vegetation plantings would be sufficient to prevent the excavated backwater channel from being filled with fines during larger flood events. It is understood that further evaluation of this issue would result from funding of the project, but that the proposed evaluation with its focus on constructing new backwatered channels rather than assessing a broad range of potential alternatives may limit the long-term effectiveness of the project’s outcomes.

The sponsor is addressing an acknowledged limiting factor for off-channel fish habitat, but there are still concerns that the project may not adequately account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

We suggest expanding the objective of the proposed assessment to review the various alternatives available to restore habitat forming processes and thus functions rather than further design of a symptomatic approach.

If the sponsor is unwilling to do so, they may be able to reduce the technical concerns of the project by addressing the following questions:

Will the study review the feasibility of maintaining backwater channel profiles as well as outlets with wood or rock structures? Will the study review the feasibility of maintaining the off-channel habitats with hydraulic controls outside of the active channel at the upstream end? If not, given the information provided by the sponsor and included above, what is the expected project lifespan?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Chelan County Natural Resources Program
Project Name: Gagnon CMZ Restoration Project
Project Number: 04-1538N
Project Location: Cashmere
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The river has a more constricted channel in this location and the design makes more sense than at the Irwin site.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project has the potential to significantly benefit salmon habitat in the lower Wenatchee.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Chelan County
Project Sponsor: Lake Chelan's Sportman's Assoc
Project Name: Beebe Springs Restoration Phase I
Project Number: 04-1701N
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project has a high cost relative to the size of the potential habitat gain.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Foster Creek
Project Sponsor: Foster Creek Conservation District
Project Name: East Foster Creek Sediment Control
Project Number: 04-1666R
Project Location: East Foster Creek
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

The applicant provided helpful information with which to further evaluate this project. They clarified that the impassable dam was at the location of a historical natural barrier. With all of the work conducted in the upland areas to reduce the flashy runoff, such as 61% of area in the CRP, this project appears to be in the right sequence for restoration activities in the watershed.

What remains unclear is how much benefit we can expect from doing this erosion control project and how many other erosion control projects will be necessary before we can expect to see significant improvements in downstream salmonid habitat. While doing this project will undoubtedly reduce sediment load to the channel, there’s insufficient information to objectively determine the benefits of the project. It’s possible that this source of sediment pales in comparison to other sources of sediment to the channel. A crude sediment budget approach that estimates the annual contribution of sediment to the system from various sources would provide helpful information to determine if the project will achieve its stated objectives.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Mason County
Project Name: Satsop Cloquallum Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1669R
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace 2 deteriorating stream crossings that are partial barriers with 10-foot wide box culverts set at no slope to improve fish passage primarily for coho but may also benefit chum and steelhead. With about 5.5 km of good quality habitat upstream of both sites, this project would be of significant benefit to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments. – Information very clear and well presented



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Lewis Conservation District
Project Name: Anderson Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1670R
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace a partial barrier on Stearns Creek with a bridge that would improve passage to 6.6 miles of decent quality habitat primarily for coho and steelhead. The WDFW Priority Index Number for the site is 49.98, which is very high.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The bankfull width of the creek is 24 feet, but it is unclear if the railroad bridge will have adequate length to provide that width for the stream. Also, no consideration was given to potential upstream regrading impacts. Further design information should be provided to address these issues. Please see the WDFW comments.

4. Other comments.

The low cost of this project is appealing.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor Co
Project Sponsor: Capitol Land Trust
Project Name: Black River Habitat Protection
Project Number: 04-1667 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The conservation easement on 75 acres of the Berquist property would primarily benefit coho, although Chinook, steelhead and chum historically used the area. Despite the historical impacts of grazing, ditching, and channelizing, the potential exists to provide a significant amount of critical off-channel habitat in the 60 acres of wetlands being protected.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force
Project Name: Polson Creek Barrier Correction
Project Number: #04-1695
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would improve fish passage on a tributary to the WF Hoquiam River that would primarily benefit coho and steelhead, although chum and Chinook could possibly use the area as well. Good project and application put together very well.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Please see the WDFW comments

4. Other comments.

Good local match. The Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force and Grays Harbor County continue to make good progress in address barriers on county roads.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Mason County
Project Name: Beeville Rd Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1668R
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace 2 small squashed culverts with a 16-foot wide squashed oval culvert set at no slope to improve fish passage for coho and chum. The main culvert is undersized, in bad condition, and a velocity barrier. With approximately 6 km of decent quality habitat upstream, this project would be of significant benefit to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

I would suggest going with a little wider culvert to provide a greater factor of safety. While the average bankfull width was estimated at 15 feet, indications of a flashy stream system with considerable stream power and sediment transport indicate that more cross-sectional area may be warranted to pass flows and debris and to maintain grade upstream and downstream. Describe your plans for maintaining grade (e.g., filling the large pool at the outlet) through this reach.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor Co
Project Sponsor: Chehalis Basin FTF
Project Name: Vance Creek Riparian Planting & Fencing
Project Number: 04-1698 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Sponsor adjusted the project to address the concerns of the Technical advisors and narrowed the scope of the riparian planting and fencing. Produced a nice planting plan map. Project is low cost and high value by involving landowners and the local community.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Good concept and could be a great vehicle for building local support for salmon recovery.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Lewis County
Project Name: Lucas Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1689R
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will improve a significant partial barrier that would improve access to 2.8 miles of good quality habitat for coho and steelhead. The replacement with a 20-foot span is appropriate but some concerns exist about providing grade control through the crossing.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Please see the WDFW comments and consider their suggestions. Good project.

4. Other comments.

Consider work downstream in the large pool as well as upstream and try to mimic natural conditions with large boulders and key wood pieces or jams to create grade control.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor
Project Sponsor: Heernet Environmental Foundation
Project Name: Mills Property Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1664A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would acquire 30 acres with 0.5 miles along Scatter Creek, which would benefit coho, chum, steelhead, and possibly chinook. The area provides important cold-water refuge for rearing and good spawning habitat

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The technical advisors only concern is that the benefits of this site may diminish significantly if the fish farm and well water input from upstream is discontinued in the future. Any information on habitat conditions prior to the influence of the well water additions may help to alleviate this concern.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Grays Harbor Co
Project Sponsor: Chehalis Basin FTF
Project Name: Wishkah County Road Sediment Control
Project Number: 04-1694 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The road sediment reduction project is proposed for a portion of the mainline county road that receives significant traffic and has a high amount of sediment delivered to the stream network. This section of road also coincides with the reach on the Wishkah River above the hatchery to the bridge crossing with the highest density of Chinook spawning. While the gravel quality in this reach appears to be in fair condition, a reduction in fine sediment would be a benefit to Chinook and other anadromous fish, such as chum and coho.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

This project almost qualifies as a project of concern because of the lack of information provided for the specific work to be performed and at what locations. The work should focus on areas of the road that deliver directly into stream channels and concentrate on the road length below the falls in the canyon at the confluence with Parker Creek (the limit of anadromous fish). Rayonier, Inc. has done a culvert survey and therefore this work should not be necessary as part of the proposal. This culvert survey information could also be used to document the expected reduction in road length or sediment delivery to streams following the completion of the work.

4. Other comments.

The initial application calls for paving a portion of the road but my understanding is that this is no longer part of the proposal and will substantially reduce the project cost. I agree that paving

is not necessary for this road. In addition, while some low spots exist on the road where runoff causes a maintenance problem for the road prism, the SRFB funding should not be used for repairing these areas, as they have no influence on aquatic habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal
Project Sponsor: Jefferson County
Project Name: Dosewallips Floodplain Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1639A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Great site for acquisition!! This one's a no-brainer.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal
Project Sponsor: Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
Project Name: Little Quilcene Estuary Restoration
Project Number: 04-1647R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project involves levee fill removal and passage improvements. It should be relatively straightforward. This appears to be an excellent project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal
Project Sponsor: Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
Project Name: Big Quilcene Estuary Dike Removal
Project Number: 04-1648R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project involves levee fill removal and woody debris placement. This appears to be an excellent companion project to the Little Quilcene project for nearly full estuarine restoration of Quilcene Bay.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal
Project Sponsor: North Olympic Salmon Coalition
Project Name: Salmon/Snow Lower Watershed Restoration (V)
Project Number: 04-1649
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project proposes the companion restoration features on lands formally acquired through SRFB and DFW funding. Good partnership effort between DFW, NOSC, Jefferson Co CD, and Jefferson Land Trust. Well sequenced.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal Coor council Inc
Project Sponsor: Skokomish Indian Tribe
Project Name: Skokomish River & Floodplain Assessment
Project Number: 04-1712 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This system and issues are complicated and require this type of analysis. Great to see an inclusive mixture of stakeholders involved. Need to have a good strategy, though, for how this information is used to generate priorities and future projects.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal Coor Council Inc
Project Sponsor: Mason County Community Dev
Project Name: Skokomish Valley Conservation Easements
Project Number: 04-1713 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Seems like a unique opportunity to protect a particularly valuable area. Well organized with willing landowner.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal
Project Sponsor: North Olympic Salmon Coalition
Project Name: Chimacum Creek Ag Land Restoration
Project Number: 04-1662R
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The buffers on at least some portions of the proposed project are small. The restoration work would primarily benefit coho and cutthroat. The stream has been significantly altered from channelization, sedimentation, lack of riparian shade and wood, and waste runoff. The project addresses some of the limiting factors, but a great deal more work will be required to restore a semblance of natural processes and functions in the stream. The proposal is higher in the watershed, which means lower benefits at a relatively high cost.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal
Project Sponsor: Northwest Watershed Institute
Project Name: Tarboo Valley Protection and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1665C
Project Location: Tarboo Creek flows into Dabob Bay
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Without more specific design and construction plans, it's difficult to evaluate the proposed remeandering of the stream. The work, however, appears to be relatively straightforward and will rely on site-specific assessments of the topography and hydrology, as well as historical information about channel locations and vegetation.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Hood Canal Coor Council Inc
Project Sponsor: Kitsap County Public Works
Project Name: WF Stavis Creek Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1318 R
Project Location: West of Poulsbo
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Originally this was a "Project of Concern". The sponsor adequately provided additional information requested by the SRFB Technical Advisors to address their concerns of the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Last remaining barrier in the system. The applicant has worked closely with WDFW on passage design.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Island County
Project Sponsor: Skagit River Sys Cooperative
Project Name: Arrowhead Lagoon Restoration
Project Number: 04-1217 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the SRFB Technical Advisor’s comments regarding the bridge. All other options for improving the associated habitat conditions have been reviewed and were not found to be acceptable alternatives. Both the SRFB and the project sponsor understand that there is a trade-off between bridge costs and the amount of bridge and lagoon fill to be removed, and the sponsor will work to optimize the outcome for salmon recovery.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Island County
Project Sponsor: Skagit River Sys Cooperative
Project Name: Arrowhead Lagoon Restoration
Project Number: 04-1217 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the SRFB Technical Advisor’s comments regarding the bridge. All other options for improving the associated habitat conditions have been reviewed and were not found to be acceptable alternatives. Both the SRFB and the project sponsor understand that there is a trade-off between bridge costs and the amount of bridge and lagoon fill to be removed, and the sponsor will work to optimize the outcome for salmon recovery.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Island County
Project Sponsor: WA Trout
Project Name: W. Whidbey Nearshore Fish Use Assessment
Project Number: 04-1262 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

See comments in “04-1262 Nearshore Evaluation” file.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: King County
Project Name: Cedar Rapids Restoration Site
Project Number: 04-1660R
Project Location: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The proposed project includes bankline restoration to improve juvenile refuge, improve riparian cover and adult holding habitat. The history of the site was well documented and is the location of previous SRFB acquisition grants for the purpose of this restoration.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is good in its approach and well established in its history and need.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8

Project Sponsor: King County Water and Land Resources

Project Name: Shaw-Landsburg- Acquisition

Project Number: 04-1354A

Project Location: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The proposed project would protect 28 acres of riparian and riverfront habitat. Existing habitat conditions appear good. Upland habitat component is small.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: City of Seattle
Project Name: Rainier Beach Shoreline Restoration
Project Number: 04-1594R
Project Location: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The proposed project is intended to modify the shoreline of Lake Washington to enhance the substrate, shoreline geometry and vegetative community. The project is proposed to address shoreline habitat needs by juvenile chinook and sockeye in an otherwise highly degraded shoreline.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Monitoring results (e.g., fish densities) in supplemental application materials support the need for this type of restoration. The monitoring indicates higher fish use densities along the beach in vegetated areas which should spread into the restored shoreline.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8

Project Sponsor: King County Water and Land Resources

Project Name: Issaquah/Carey/Holder- Acquisition

Project Number: 04-1302A

Project Location: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Companion protection project with past SRFB funded projects improving connectivity. Willing and cooperative landowner.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 8
Project Sponsor: City of Redmond
Project Name: Bear Creek Mouth Restoration
Project Number: 04-1699R
Project Location: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Well supported technically with a continuation of successful project design and implementation along this reach.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 9
Project Sponsor: City of Burien
Project Name: Seahurst Park Nearshore Restoration
Project Number: 04-1423R
Project Location: Burien
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will restore nearshore conditions along 1,000 feet of shoreline that has consistent use by juvenile chinook, chum, coho, sockeye, and steelhead. The landslides from the bluff provide important sediment inputs for forage fish spawning and other benthic prey of salmon. This project should have significant benefits to salmon and has a high likelihood of achieving those benefits. However, no assurances are given that the sediment inputs will be sufficient to avoid future nourishment actions.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Monitoring will be worthwhile here beyond construction to follow recovery of beach.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 9
Project Sponsor: King County Water and Land Resources
Project Name: Piner Point on Maury Island
Project Number: 04-1335A
Project Location: Maury Island
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will conserve 1,500 feet of nearshore habitat that has consistent use by juvenile chinook, chum, coho, sockeye, pink, and steelhead. The active landslide complex and its location at the divergence of two drift cells makes this a unique area that is important to maintain nearshore habitat conditions for many miles of shoreline beyond these parcels. While the parcels are within a landslide hazard area, development on one or two parcels would likely occur in the future. This project should have significant benefits to salmon and has a high likelihood of achieving those benefits.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 9

Project Sponsor: King County DNR

Project Name: Lower Newaukum Creek Restoration

Project Number: 04-1338

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project is sound and will improve habitat conditions, particularly Newaukum Creek's alluvial valley floodplain. On-site topographic and hydrologic information will ultimately guide the proper design and construction of wood structures.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 9
Project Sponsor: City of Kent
Project Name: Mill Creek/Green River Restoration
Project Number: 04-1323
Project Location: Kent Valley
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project will provide in-stream complexity and cover for migrant chinook fry and other juvenile salmonids along approximately 1,000 feet of the Green River and lower Mill Creek, respectively. This project addresses a critical habitat feature missing in the lower Green River and should have significant benefits to chinook and other salmon. The wood placement and riparian plantings should be relatively straightforward and has a high likelihood of achieving the stated benefits.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: King 9

Project Sponsor: Seattle Art Museum

Project Name: Elliot Bay Nearshore Restoration at Olympic Sculpture Park

Project Number: 04-1421R

Project Location: Seattle

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

This project seems to enjoy substantial public support from backers of the new sculpture park and proposes to enhance a short stretch of beach habitat among a continuous strip of riprap and compromised shoreline. Proponents want to include several hundred feet of fish habitat bench constructed to support forage fish spawning, epibenthic production and juvenile salmon migration, but it is an engineered structure that will require regular maintenance. Kelp bed habitat consisting of sub-tidal riprap will be capable of supporting kelp colonization but there are a lot of uncertainties for whether it would ever recolonized. There are lots of subtidal riprap and natural shorelines that do not currently support much kelp habitat. At least not the healthy overstory types of kelp (bull kelp) indicated in the drawings and narrative. The riprap may support ribbon kelp and other brown and green algae. The habitat bench is of marginal benefit as it is very flat and enjoys a very narrow band of elevation. Epibenthic production will certainly occur on the bench but would likely be limited due to the lack of horizontal diversity at the bench. Also the bench is bordered above and below by large angular rock which does not support diverse epibenthic prey items and would act as habitat for shallow water predators such as sculpin, juvenile rockfish and other piscivorous fishes.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

The beach component is better able to provide all necessary habitat components such as correct sediment, backshore vegetation and shallow subtidal substrate but the processes that would otherwise maintain this site are not available and so it is reliant upon human intervention for its sustainability. Though the proponents are enthusiastic about its benefit it remains an expensive add-on to a non-

environmental project. The idea of providing a place for juvenile salmon to rest and feed remains a valid concept but it is essential the habitat provided is healthy and sustainable. Suggest keeping the POC designation unless the costs associated with the fish bench feature are removed, a full and functioning vegetative buffer is provided to support backshore functions, and clarity if provided for the sponsors ability to maintain the site over the long term.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Specific criteria the Technical Advisors used to term this as a project of concern are:

- Information provided, or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
- The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the costs.
- The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
- The stewardship plan is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance of the project and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: Kitsap County of
Project Name: Kitsap Nearshore Salmon Habitat Assessment
Project Number: 04-1442 N
Project Location: East Kitsap Peninsula Shoreline
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Approach complements methods recently developed for Bainbridge Island. Use of existing expertise should assist in a successful assessment and data analysis/sharing. Fills an identified data gap.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Document assumptions.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: Kitsap County
Project Name: Chico Creek Instream Restoration
Project Number: 04-1209
Project Location: Near Bremerton
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Opportunity to restore a reach of Chico creek which is a very productive stream. There is obviously a significant need for restoration of this reach. The project is out of sequence a bit, with the box culvert needing correction first. However, the applicant has committed to requesting funding for replacement in the next cycle.

The project location goes through a golf course which can affect the quality of vegetation allowed near the creek. No mention of the vegetative buffers and quality in proposal.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

More detail on allowable vegetative quality and buffer size is needed to ensure the meander belt has enough recruitment of LWD and adequate shading/ prey production for juveniles. Otherwise it seems like a good project.

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: City of Bainbridge Island
Project Name: Close Shoreline Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1308A
Project Location: West side of Bainbridge Island
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Minimal request of IAC to ensure protection of this area. Since much of the parcel is upland, this seems appropriate.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The SRFB funded Bainbridge Nearshore Assessment has identified this project site as one of the most important to protect on the Island. This project builds on past Bainbridge Island Land Trust successes but uses the Nearshore Assessment, local planning experience, to propose the project. This project should create momentum for similar land acquisitions around the Island to protect the remaining natural habitat, or restore compromised habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: MPSFEG
Project Name: Beaver Creek and Estuary Restoration
Project Number: 04-1402R
Project Location: Manchester
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

Encourage project designers to ensure final design is consistent with previous upstream work. Adaptive management approaches well thought out in response to Technical Advisors concerns.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: SPS Salmon Enhancement Group
Project Name: Rocky Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1380
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

These are the last remaining critical barriers to address in this drainage.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: Mid-Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group
Project Name: Olalla Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1429R
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project has been well thought out with much of the design work completed. The passage correction is located near the estuary, would benefit chum and coho, and has a fairly high priority index (PI).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The 12-foot wide arch pipe appeared to be right at the threshold of the minimum size requirements.

4. Other comments.

Good job highlighting the conifer planting in the riparian zone.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap
Project Sponsor: SPS Salmon Enhancement Group
Project Name: Little Minter Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1375R
Project Location: Pierce County portion of Key Peninsula
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Excellent submittal. Project design is well thought out.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Kitsap

Project Sponsor: 10,000 Years Institute

Project Name: Schel-chelb Estuary

Project Number: 04-1314C

Project Location: Schel-chelb Estuary on Bainbridge Island

Project Type: Restoration and Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The acquisition costs are justified given the developable lot, which will be protected in perpetuity and restored, to intertidal marsh. The project has good landowner and technical support and is well sequenced.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: Columbia Land Trust
Project Name: Klickitat River Conservation and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1715C
Project Location: Klickitat River
Project Type: Combined

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: WDFW
Project Name: Snyder Creek Mill Site Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1714R
Project Location: Snyder Creek
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: Mid-Columbia RFEG
Project Name: Lower Klickitat Riparian Re-Veg
Project Number: 04-1711 R
Project Location: Klickitat River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Klickitat County
Project Sponsor: Yakama Nation
Project Name: Tepee Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1716R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Project would replace 3 partial barriers to juvenile salmonids on a tributary to White River that provides important spawning and rearing habitat to steelhead. Additional information was provided by the sponsor to answer the initial concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Columbia Land Trust
Project Name: Germany Creek Conservation and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1563 C
Project Location: Germany Creek
Project Type: Acquisition and Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would acquire 155 ac of riparian, floodplain, and associated upland habitat with about 1 river mile including the confluence with the Columbia River estuary. The project would benefit multiple salmonid species, including chum, chinook, coho, and steelhead. Restoration actions focused on chum but also would benefit other species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Off-channel rearing habitat will be created by connecting old gravel quarry ponds to the stream. Some design issues still need to be resolved but should not affect the certainty of success. Providing basic water surface elevations for the ponds/river would help to evaluate the off-channel pond type. Spawning channel would utilize existing overflow channel in a braided channel reach. While some concerns exist about future channel migration into the spawning channel, the project is still likely to provide important short-term benefits to the threatened chum. Otherwise, the site location appears to be excellent with a source of cool groundwater upwelling from the hillside.

The success of groundwater channels for chum spawning is dependent on capturing active river groundwater flow within the excavated area, and having enough gradient for the water to flow (which attracts fish). Project location should be based on low-level groundwater pump

tests/excavation to ensure these conditions. Also, an assessment of flood frequency relative to project life is needed (for backwater considerations and overland flow upstream).



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia

Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group

Project Name: Lower Washougal Restoration Phase 1

Project Number: 04-1573R

Project Location:

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would construct two boulder dams to shift flow into historical channels providing better spawning habitat for chum and chinook, restore habitat complexity by adding LWD and boulders, and rehabilitate three quarries as ten acres of off-channel habitat that would benefit threatened chum as well as multiple other salmonid species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

It isn’t clear if you can actually divert the water because no floodplain elevations are provided. A few key elevations around the floodplain could verify this. As part of the design (in order to move the success of permitting along) include a feasibility study that analyzes the basic hydraulics and geomorphology of the site.

4. Other comments.

The long-term viability and function of the rock dams have some uncertainty, but would still provide shorter-term benefits by providing critical habitat to threatened chum stock.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce
Project Name: Fort Columbia Tidal Wetland Restoration
Project Number: 04-1570 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project restores tidal connection to a distributary channel and 96-acre wetland in the Baker Bay area of the Columbia River estuary in the Chinook River watershed. The project would benefit multiple salmonid species, particularly chinook by changing an isolated freshwater wetland back to a saltwater marsh.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

It is important to maintain the widest possible connection with tidal influence to realize the project benefits, but this will not be worked out until the design phase is complete. With the need for a self-regulating tide gate, flow velocities may preclude much use of the wetland area by juvenile salmonids. The project’s success may also depend on other shoreline modifications to attract fish in the vicinity and improve the chances of finding the wetland area. Long-term maintenance of the tide gate is also a question.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Ducks Unlimited
Project Name: Baker Bay Estuary Restoration
Project Number: 04-1559 R
Project Location: Lower Columbia River, Wallacut Slough
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would reconnect approximately 40 acres of saltmarsh estuary habitat along Wallacut River near Baker Bay as a result of dike and tide-gate removal that would benefit multiple salmonid species, particularly chinook. The project would also treat invasive plant species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The breaches should not restrict the flow.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia

Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group

Project Name: Influence of Carcass Analogs Study

Project Number: 04-1576N

Project Location: Lewis and Wind River Watersheds

Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

This nutrient supplementation pilot project would help to evaluate the effectiveness of the analog approach to oligotrophic stream systems. The project addresses a potential problem due to a reduction in the historical transport of marine-derived nutrients from salmon carcasses that were likely vital to the productivity of the system. This would primarily benefit juvenile fish including steelhead and multiple other salmonid species in many potential watersheds. The nutrients would be added and monitored for two years.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia

Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group

Project Name: Upper Washougal River LWD Placement

Project Number: 04-1575R

Project Location: Upper Washougal River

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would primarily benefit steelhead, chinook, and coho by adding ELJ, wood, and rock to capture substrate. This project clearly addresses the critical problem of a lack of large wood and substrate due to splash damming. Probably about 15 ELJs could be constructed for the money and would likely provide both short- and long-term benefits due to anchoring much of the wood into bedrock.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Increase the unit costs for the engineered log jams. It is critical they be sized large enough to restore major channel function. Construction access may be difficult which could drive the cost up. Also, the cost to anchor the jams may be higher than planned.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia

Project Sponsor: Grays River Habitat Enhancement District

Project Name: PUD Bar Habitat Enhancement – Grays River

Project Number: 04-1448 R

Project Location: Grays River

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

The project sponsor provided excellent information about the site and details about the project. There’s little question that this project is attempting to address key limiting factors for critically depressed stocks of salmonids, particularly chum. The project would likely increase shading to the stream and provide cover for fish. We are less confident in its ability to influence sedimentation and channel stability. We are concerned that the project may not be successful as a “short-term” fix because the proposed rock structures have a high likelihood of being buried within a decade after installation. This reach experienced historical channel migration that has been greatly exacerbated by loss of riparian vegetation and upstream sediment inputs, particularly from the Gorley Springs avulsion, which is likely to continue providing large volumes of sediment to the project location. The project, therefore, does not sufficiently account for conditions or processes in the watershed and is unlikely to achieve its stated objective of reduced sedimentation and channel stability. We certainly understand that a balance needs to be found between property protection and habitat restoration, but are unsure that the current proposal will appropriately address either concern.

It is difficult to evaluate this type of project without a field tour, and it is unfortunate that a site visit could not be organized early on for this project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Provide more justification for the need to address a problem for chum with a short-term bank erosion fix at the expense of the long-term benefits of creating a more naturally functioning dynamic channel system with improved floodplain connectivity and complexity.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Loss of riparian cover and upstream sedimentation are certainly factors that may have caused the more recent avulsion and bank erosion in this reach and siltation downstream. The project would use rock vanes to deflect flow into one channel where riparian cover would provide more shade. Rock and root wads would be used to create pools and cover, respectively. Riparian revegetation is planned, but unclear if the root systems would extend far enough to protect the banks. The project is a part of a larger strategic approach with the COE to address channel problems in the lower river, but it is unclear how this approach balances the need for protection of property with the natural river dynamics and long-term creation of good quality habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Clark County
Project Name: Jones Creek Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1562R
Project Location: Washougal River Watershed
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace three culverts at a crossing that is a partial barrier (primarily to juveniles) in Jones Creek (tributary to Little Washougal) and open access to about 2.4 miles of generally good quality habitat (although summer low flows are problematic due to water withdrawals) in a rural residential area for coho, sea-run cutthroat, and winter and summer steelhead.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Serious consideration should be given to using a bridge at this site rather than a large culvert because of the channel width and road bed elevation. Also, with a bankfull width of 22 feet and a culvert size of 28 feet wide, this is pushing the limits on stream simulation design.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Underwood Conservation District
Project Name: Little Wind River Restoration Planning
Project Number: 04-1558R
Project Location:
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would assess habitat conditions, fish distribution and densities, and develop preliminary designs for fish passage, riparian and stream channel restoration projects in the Little Wind River drainage that would benefit steelhead, coho, and possibly chinook.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Unclear why collecting flow measurements every 2 weeks for 6 months and how this would feed into project development. Estimates of streamflow from cross-sectional work and spot measurements is likely sufficient for project development. If streamflow is going to be measured, suggest installing a data logger, establish a gage site and monitoring continuously and more accurately. This short term data could then be correlated with other local stream gages, and with existing models develop one for the Little Wind.

4. Other comments.

The area probably lacks LWD and has some potentially high temperatures (max 19 deg C), but is likely to provide important habitat in area where little is known.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia

Project Sponsor: Lower Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group

Project Name: Indian Mary Creek Restoration

Project Number: 04-1577R

Project Location: Trib to Franz Lake and Columbia River

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace a complete passage barrier with a bridge to restore access to 3,000 feet of stream channel with decent habitat (provides cold water refuge where Lake Franze warms considerably in the summer) and 10 acres of rearing habitat that would benefit primarily coho and steelhead, but could also benefit chum and juvenile chinook. The project would also place some wood for cover and habitat complexity.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The project cost seems low for a bridge. Perhaps if a Flat car RR bridge is used this will work. The quality of these structures is highly variable and the landowner should be on board for this type of bridge. With the outfall and culvert slope the overall drop is 5 feet. If log weirs are proposed juvenile passage is a concern (0.7 feet drop) seven weirs will be required. Spaced at 20 feet on center will require a 140 foot reach of channel for the construction.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Wahkiakum County Public Works
Project Name: Crown Camp Road Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1553R
Project Location: Duck Creek, trib to Elochoman River
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would address the lower partial barrier (likely a bridge) on Duck Creek (trib to Elochoman Ck), which primarily benefits coho and steelhead by providing improved access to at least one mile and in the future to over 2.85 miles of habitat (including area beyond forestland barrier). Local upstream habitat is generally of poor quality although habitat improves upstream. There are additional partial barriers upstream which plan to be addressed in the next 3 to 4 years. Upper partial barrier has washed out and provides access, but crossing will need to be addressed in the future.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

There is no description of the stream channel work which will be required after the bridge is removed. With the outfall drop of 1.2 and the 2% slope through the culvert the total drop to make up is 2.2 feet. Over the 50 foot length this is a 4.4% slope.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Lewis County Conservation District
Project Name: Woods Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1565R
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Woods Creek supports primarily coho and possibly steelhead. This project would replace 4 partial barrier culverts with open bottom structures and improve passage to 4.5 miles of good quality habitat upstream.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Primarily a barrier for juvenile fish migration rather than for adults. It is difficult to provide comment on the proposed corrections, because data such as outfall drop, culvert slope, proposed structure sizes, channel regrade, etc are not provided. In general SRFB fish passage projects are evaluated using guidance from Washington State for culvert design.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia
Project Sponsor: Clark County
Project Name: Emerick Creek Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1561R
Project Location: Trib to Cedar Creek and N. Fk. Lewis River
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would replace culverts at two road crossings that are partial barriers (primarily to juveniles) in Emerick Creek (Lewis River watershed) and open access to about 2,600 feet of moderate to poor quality habitat in a rural residential area for coho, sea-run cutthroat, and winter steelhead.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Based on the channel bankfull width of 9 feet the proposed culvert widths need to be larger to meet the stream simulation guidance (2.2 feet for the NE 414th and 3.5 feet for the Munch Road). This size increase may effect the project cost estimate.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia

Project Sponsor: Mid-Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group

Project Name: Middle Wind River Habitat Enhancement

Project Number: 04-1554 R

Project Location: Wind River

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives, and the projects main focus is property protection.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Show how installation of the rock structures would improve spawning habitat and channel complexity. The main concern is the aggrading reach relative to the rock structures. The project sponsor provided information that the structures may become partially buried, but noted they would still direct shear stresses toward the center of the channel. How will this improve spawning habitat and channel complexity if the channel form they create gets buried?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON

Project Sponsor: Capitol Land Trust

Project Name: Oakland Bay / Malaney Creek Habitat Aquisition

Project Number: 04-1464A

Project Location:

Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Please see nearshore review comments

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Good match and local partnerships



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON
Project Sponsor: SPSSEG
Project Name: WRIA 14 Nearshore Development
Project Number: 04-1474N
Project Location:
Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

.

4. Other comments.

See nearshore review comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Hiawata Creek culvert replacement
Project Number: 04-1470R
Project Location:
Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Project sponsor appears to have given a lot of thought in solving a difficult problem.

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW review. Sponsor provided additional detail on the fill height and bridge length.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: MASON
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Jarrell Creek culvert replacement
Project Number: 04-1471R
Project Location:
Project Type:

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Project sponsor appears to have done a lot of preliminary work in pre-project planning.

4. Other comments.

Some questions were raised on the cost/benefit of the project. If a full PI has been completed please provide this information. WDFW calculated 14.9 using the map-generated method. Spring fed system with over one mile of habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Nisqually Indian Tribe
Project Sponsor: Nisqually Land Trust
Project Name: Nisqually/Powell Protection & Restoration
Project Number: 04-1637 C
Project Location:
Project Type: Combination

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Important piece of property to be purchased along with eliminating two fish passage barriers.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Nisqually Indian Tribe
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Mashel Restoration & Acquisition Phasell
Project Number: 04-1437 C
Project Type: Combination

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Originally this was a “Project of Concern”. The Lead Entity provided two responses. In the second response they eliminated the in-stream work in the confined channel that was of concern.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Though this project has been removed from the project of concern list, there are still some concerns that should be addressed by the sponsor should the project be funded. See below.

- Clarify who will be purchasing the conservation easements and developing the stewardship plan.
- Work directly with IAC staff and WDFW Technical Assistance on the preliminary design phase for developing the instream projects.
- Developed a detailed scope of work outlining the proposed work and worksite locations.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Nisqually Indian Tribe
Project Sponsor: Nisqually Land Trust
Project Name: Miller Shoreline Protection
Project Number: 04-1658 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Nisqually Indian Tribe
Project Sponsor: Nisqually Land Trust
Project Name: Nipper Shoreline Protection
Project Number: 04-1623 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

There is low potential for threat to **salmon** habitat conditions if the protection project is not completed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project was removed from the project of concern list. The project sponsor provided the needed detail that included a map of the current and future property lines.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: NOBLE

Project Sponsor: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

Project Name: Dungeness River RR Bridge Reach Restoration

Project Number: 04-1589R

Project Location: Dungeness River immediately below Hwy 101

Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This seems like a great project. The need for Habitat diversity is very clear. Currently, pool habitat is almost non-existent within this reach.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: NOPL
Project Sponsor: Agnew Irrigation District
Project Name: Agnew/Dungeness Water Conservation
Project Number: 04-1663R
Project Location: Dungeness River
Project Type: Upland - Water Conservation

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

A proven record of success with projects of this nature in increasing instream flows for fish spawning and rearing habitat by reducing irrigation water withdrawals from Dungeness River.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

It appears this project is consistent with past projects for similar type of work which the LE tech members feel has worked well. The 2 to 4 cfs savings is within the standard error of measurement for stream flow measurements so you can't really monitor it. But, the data presented shows a trend down for water quantity withdrawal.

4. Other comments.

Under the Dungeness Water Users Association/Dept. of Ecology Trust Water Right MOU, 2/3 of conserved water remains as instream flow not available for future water right allocation. 1/3 remains available for agricultural use up to a maximum of 7000 irrigated acres. Agricultural use has remained consistent over the past ten years at 5750 to 6000 acres.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: NOPL
Project Sponsor: DNR – Olympic Region
Project Name: Sadie/Susie Barrier Removals
Project Number: 04-1546R
Project Location: Lyre/Hoko River
Project Type: Instream passage/habitat

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No, however...**

Ineligible – SRFB policy does not allow funding of potential Forest and Fish projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

RCW 75.46.170 (8) was passed into law in 2000, through Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2589, which states:

"The board may award a grant or loan for a salmon recovery project on private or public land when the landowner has a legal obligation under local, state or federal law to perform the project, when expedited action provides a clear benefit to salmon recovery, and there will be harm to salmon recovery if the project is delayed. For purposes of this subsection, a legal obligation does not include a project required solely as a mitigation or condition of permitting. "

This law provided the SRFB with the authority to fund or not fund projects covered under an existing law...such as fish passage, screens, diversions, etc.

In response to the above law, the SRFB on June 15, 2001 and again on December 5, 2003, declared by policy that "silvicultural treatments and other forest practices" means all activities covered by the Forest & Fish Program and the Forest Practices Act, RCW 76.09. What this means is that the SRFB will not fund fish passage projects (culverts) on lands covered by Forest & Fish Program requirements.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: NOPLC

Project Sponsor: North Olympic Salmon Coalition

Project Name: Morse Creek Restoration Feasibility Study

Project Number: 04-1590 N

Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

The proposal offers a clear method for planning future restoration actions. There are many physical constraints and landowner issues that need to be identified and considered before any restoration actions can take place. This project has a high likelihood of achieving that.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: NOBLE
Project Sponsor: Clallam County of
Project Name: Clallam River Habitat Assessment
Project Number: 04-1537 N
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Sound project design. Needed to help understand periodic river mouth closure issue as well as identifying restoration and protection priorities. Has a high likelihood of achieving its stated objectives.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: NOBLE
Project Sponsor: DNR Olympic Region
Project Name: Hoko River Habitat Restoration
Project Number: 04-1547 R
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

This project provides a complex solution to an identified concern. Well sequenced. No obligations to complete project components under Forest and Fish Agreement.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: North Olympic Peninsula
Project Sponsor: Fish & Wildlife Dept of
Project Name: Nearshore Central Strait of Juan de Fuca
Project Number: 04-1591 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **YES**
Why?

This project proposed to define habitat trajectories using a modeling approach with predictive capability to link sediment changes from Elwha Dam removal and alterations to fish habitat. The predictions are presumed necessary to tailor restoration work as the changes in sediment delivery from this large capital project may alter habitat-forming processes in the nearby nearshore areas. Specifics on the approach proposed are not given. Whether the results can be 1) validated and 2) remain valid over time are still unanswered questions.

There is enough concern over the ability of this approach to provide valid results that can be capitalized on that it continues to warrant the POC label. There is too much uncertainty over benefits of this project given the unknown timeframe for Elwha removal and resultant changes in sediment supply.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

The result of this study may likely be a best guess at habitat changes that cannot be confirmed until after dam removal and be possibly overcome as real changes occur on the landscape. Suggest this approach is premature and should be rescoped with clearer objective and resubmitted in 6th round.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Specific criteria the Technical Advisors used to term this as a project of concern are:

- There are significant constraints to the implementation of high priority projects following completion of the assessment.
- It is unclear how the assessment will achieve its stated objectives.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: North Olympic Peninsula
Project Sponsor: Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition
Project Name: Bogachiel Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1592 R
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is a WDFW design, and the key to the project is replacement of the undersized culvert. Final design should address roughened channel design details, calculations etc. Appendix E of the Culvert Design Manual can be used as guidance for this.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: North Olympic Peninsula
Project Sponsor: Clallam Co Public Works Dept
Project Name: Clallam County Culvert Assessment
Project Number: 04-1510 N
Project Location: Clallam County
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The applicant understands that the option they have selected can lead to project prioritization with other available information and input from concerned parties. However, some sort of habitat assessment will have to be done later in order to obtain a ranked list of potential projects. In general, a road based inventory is a good starting point, but work will still need to be done in the future to fill in the gaps left by this type of inventory.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: North Olympic Peninsula
Project Sponsor: Science/Technology/Manufacturer
Project Name: RENEW Clallam Bay Nearshore
Project Number: 04-1593 N
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

1. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits.
2. The assessment does not account for the processes in the upper watershed.
3. There are significant constraints to the implementation of estuarine, alongshore, and watershed projects.
4. Given the potential restoration projects initially identified, it is unlikely that the assessment will achieve its stated objectives of restoring habitat diversity, while addressing causes rather than symptoms.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

If assessment were needed, a more specific plan to address a smaller subset of issues would be a good starting point.

It seems like this project is dependent on the Clallam River Habitat Assessment study, especially the stream hydrology. Recommend completing inventory and assessment work in upper watershed with implementation of major sediment control and human impact measures before determining course of action at mouth.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Agree that a planning approach is appropriate to this complex issue.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Project Name: Fulton Dam Fish Passage Barrier Removal
Project Number: 04-1485R
Project Location: Chewuch River near Winthrop
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

- Provides for threatened spring Chinook, as well as steelhead and bull trout by removing rock dam that serves as partial barrier at certain flows with a roughened channel. While the dam is a partial barrier, it’s obviously not ideal to have it remain in place and as it’s near the confluence with the Methow, likely causes juvenile mortality for most of the Chewuch run.
- The sponsor adequately provided additional information requested by the SRFB Technical Advisors to address their concerns of the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Clearly a lot of discussion has occurred between PUD, landowners and fish agencies already regarding this project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Chewuch Basin Riparian Protection
Project Number: 04-1492 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Protection

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan/Colville
Project Sponsor: Colville Confederated Tribes
Project Name: Okanogan R. Thermal & Lidar Image-Phase 2
Project Number: 04-1717N
Project Location: Okanogan watershed
Project Type: Non-capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The sponsor provided additional information to adequately address the SRFB Technical Advisor’s concerns.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation
Project Name: Chewuch Dam Fish Passage Barrier Removal
Project Number: 04-1489R
Project Location: Chewuch River near Winthrop
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

- Provides for threatened spring Chinook, as well as steelhead and bull trout by removing rock dam that serves as a partial barrier at certain flows with a roughened channel.
- The sponsor adequately provided additional information to address the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Lower Beaver Creek Piping
Project Number: 04-1688R
Project Location: Beaver Creek near Twisp
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The project would pipe two ditches but unclear if water would be sufficient to prevent downstream dewatering. Benefits appear to be dependent on addressing Fort Thurlow passage barrier, which is scheduled for correction by 2005. The project makes incremental progress towards flow increases.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan/Colville
Project Sponsor: Upper Columbia Regional Fish Enhancement
Project Name: Rockview Diversion
Project Number: 04-1494 R
Project Location: Methow River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Okanogan Conservation District
Project Name: Maracci Diversion and Piping
Project Number: 04-1301R
Project Location: Beaver Creek near Twisp
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Okanogan County/Colville Tribes
Project Sponsor: Upper Columbia RFEG
Project Name: Similkameen River Riparian Habitat Protection
Project Number: 04-1586A
Project Location: Similkameen River near Oroville
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Pacific CD
Project Name: Johnson Creek restoration
Project Number: 04-1622R
Project Location: Willapa Bay
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

Good project

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Work the WDFW engineering on the design concepts and final design.

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW review comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Willapa Bay RFEG
Project Name: Oxbow Creek Construction Phase
Project Number: 04-1627R
Project Location: Trib to Willapa River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Engineering design was completed last grant cycle. Sponsor ready to proceed to construction. Application material well presented.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW passage review.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Sportsmen's National Land Trust
Project Name: Skidmore Slough Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1636C
Project Location: Raymond
Project Type: Acquisition/Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? ☒ Y ☐ N

Why?

The Technical Advisors have the following concerns:

- Sequencing of project may be wrong
- Project has a high cost relative to anticipated benefits
- It is unclear how the project will achieve its objectives

Many of the stated restoration goals are tiered into what happens after the SRFB awards a grant for the property acquisition. The project does not deal with the tide gate, a key component in restoring salmonid access. It does not deal with fish passage at a failing culvert on South Bend Road. Sediment production from the adjacent road appears to be overstated – levels of sediment from surface erosion are directly related to the level of road use by heavy motorized vehicles, quality of surfacing material and the delivery potential to flowing waters.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

Change the project to an assessment of the flooding impacts from removal of the tide gate and culvert.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The sponsor has good rational for proposing the acquisition of target lands ahead of addressing the tide gate that drives the Skidmore Slough system though in a perfect world the tide gate would be fixed first. The nearshore report indicated that some rational should be given for the acquisition given the tide gate isn't being addressed to which the sponsor provided ample discussion for the approach. The nearshore also asked that a schedule be provided for future work to which the sponsor provided a table outlining their plans for further restoration.

The proponent states the acquisition area is under heavy development pressure and provides information to back up the statements. The question here is twofold. One is whether the acquisition costs are reasonable for the lands and habitat being protected. If there is no outstanding concern over the habitat on the acquisition lands, is there then a is question of whether future work will be done. It would appear, there is a still question of whether future work will be conducted to ensure this property is brought to its maximum capability. Yet, there is evidence in the response (commissioners reaction/funding limitations) that indicates the protection of this property should occur first to prevent the situation becoming more complicated and costly in the future

Still, without access by salmon to this location is difficult to show the acquisition will provide benefits to salmon. The threat of development is not enough to show benefits to salmon from a purchase even in light of a broader vision for the area. Criteria used indicate a direct need for salmon benefits. The proposal needs evidence that the acquisition will benefit salmon in that they can regularly access the site or a stronger link to the tide gate issue so that the certainty of this issue being resolved is enhanced. Suggest the proposal include some level of assessment on the tide gate in conjunction with this acquisition to improve certainty that the tide gate will be fixed.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County

Project Sponsor: Miranda Wecker, Coastal Resources Alliance (CRA)

Project Name: Ranking of Estuarine Habitat Restoration

Project Number: 04-1641N

Project Location: Willapa Bay

Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Most all the tide gates and associated habitat associated with WSDOT roads have been documented by WDFW through the interagency agreement with WSDOT. Some of these culverts/tide gates are on the 6 year plan for correction. The final product from this study is not clear. Will the sites identified have enough data to become projects, or will further assessment be needed on some sites (example: Skidmore slough)?

4. Other comments.

Please see the Nearshore Review comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Sportmen's National Land Trust
Project Name: Willapa River Acquisition and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1645C
Project Location: Willapa River, Pacific County
Project Type: Acquisition/Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The Technical Advisors review a detailed response from the sponsor. The sponsor has addressed the concerns noted previously which related to project cost relative to the anticipated benefits, it is unclear how the entire project will achieve its stated objective and the sequencing may be wrong. The sponsor provided a 24 page detailed response addressing these concerns.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Willapa Bay RFEG
Project Name: North Stream
Project Number: 04-1650R
Project Location: Willapa Bay NWR
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

The objective of the project is increase access to areas blocked (1.6 miles) by human-caused impediments, and to restore the Biological important elements of spawning/rearing to about 2 miles of stream. North Stream is in the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge (WNWR), on property recently added to the refuge. WNWR and WBRFEG recently commissioned three studies to evaluate the limiting factors of the new property. These studies show limiting factors of access 100% blocking for Chum, and loss of spawning and rearing for Chum, Coho, and Cutthroat on North Stream.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW comments. Good project and application well presented



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pacific County
Project Sponsor: Shorebank Enterprise Pacific
Project Name: Bear River Channel Restoration
Project Number: 04-1661R
Project Location: Bear River, Trib to Willapa Bay
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

LWD placement in trib to Bear River. Current conditions lack LWD but are not highly degraded. Benefit moderate but priority low.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pend Oreille
Project Sponsor: Lone Town of
Project Name: Cedar Creek Fish Passage Restoration
Project Number: 04-1372 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Last year had concerns about introgression between bull trout/brook trout and west slope cutthroat/rainbow trout, actual use by bull trout and downstream partial barrier, but these appear to have been addressed.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pend Oreille
Project Sponsor: Pend Oreille Conservation Dist
Project Name: Priest Basin Barrier Assessment
Project Number: 04-1480 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Identify passage barriers with PI’s in tributaries to the Priest River, which supports threatened adfluvial bull trout as well as westslope cutthroat trout. Nearly half of the survey would be conducted on basins that only support relatively isolated populations of westslope cutthroat trout. The top 5 projects would have prelim designs. Project has a high likelihood of identifying projects of significant benefit to these native fish.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pend Oreille
Project Sponsor: Pend Oreille Conservation Dist
Project Name: Indian Creek Diversion Screening
Project Number: 04-1373 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

Would improve diversion site to improve fish passage for bull trout and add some flow from changing to pipe conveyance, although unclear how significant this is. Somewhat dependent upon the completion of two other proposed barrier removal sites. The benefits are probably low because it doesn’t seem to be a significant problem currently and other issues are more likely impacting use by bull trout. The proposed designs should get some further expert scrutiny.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The probability of brook trout in the system should be addressed in the project proposal because it is likely a major threat to bull trout recovery. It would also be helpful for this proposal to mention any future projects (if any) are planned in Indian Creek.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pierce County
Project Sponsor: Cascade Land Conservancy
Project Name: S. Prairie Creek Acquisition Restoration
Project Number: 04-1687 C
Project Location:
Project Type: Combination

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The Technical Advisors recommend that the sponsor and its partners consider in-stream and bank/floodplain restoration as needed to improve channel conditions and floodplain connection within the Inglin Farm Reach of South Prairie Creek. Further reach assessment, in addition to the flooding and channel migration zone studies being performed by Pierce County may be needed to assess need and construction alternatives. If future instream and bank work is warranted it would be appropriate to plan access routes within the planting area for heavy equipment to access the stream. These actions may also serve to help restore fish access to Tributary 2.

A good example of this issue is the waste storage tank from the dairy. The Technical Advisors would recommend removing this completely from the historically active channel and floodplain if not cost prohibitive. Long-term planning should consider the need to remove the existing access bridge and other structures in the riparian zone and floodplain if possible.

4. Other comments.

Good match with several partners. The Technical Advisors would like to thank the sponsor for providing the maps, aerial photos, restoration plan, and detailed responses to our questions.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pierce County
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Electron Fish Screen Feasibility Project
Project Number: 04-1476 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

This feasibility study will identify alternatives that will dramatically increase smolt survival of fish that enter the forebay and flume. Several options will be addressed and probable construction costs will be developed for each action. upper 26 miles of habitat for Chinook, steelhead, coho, and char. While the site is a high priority area that would benefit salmon, many uncertainties exist about implementing a solution. The alternatives being evaluated should consider the eventual probability of channel avulsion around the diversion dam. Old side channels are located on the adjacent floodplain and coupled with the recent road washout indicate a propensity for near-term channel migration. If a channel avulsion occurred, what are the chances that the diversion dam would cease to be used?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pierce County
Project Sponsor: Pierce Co Water Programs Div
Project Name: Levee Setback Feasibility Study
Project Number: 04-1216 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Excellent concept.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The technical advisors suggested that the sponsor eliminate the Terrian Visualization Video if it is not a critical part of informing landowners and others of a future levee setback project.

4. Other comments.

Originally considered a project of concern. Sponsor provided a detailed task description and a cost breakdown. This addressed the Technical Advisors concerns.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pierce County
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Nearshore Restoration Design Project
Project Number: 04-1478 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project has a high cost relative to anticipated benefits and there are significant constraints to the implementation of high priority projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Are there assurances that these projects can be implemented?

Another, more cost effective approach is to select one or two potential sites and do feasibility and designs for those sites.

4. Other comments.

Initial comments for POC included cost/benefit and implementation of future projects. Nearshore report had no significant concerns. It would appear the decisions made on this project to warrant the POC label were based on an incomplete understanding of the project. This proposal is in keeping with adjacent WRIAs in an attempt to have a consistent nearshore response to project identification and design. Costs are higher in this proposal because Pierce County has to conduct both an assessment of nearshore conditions and a project identification and design project whereas adjacent WRIA’s have already conducted the assessment portion. While there may still be areas where work can be trimmed back and still retain adequate understanding of the nearshore to provide decision makers with appropriate projects to design it is overall a thoughtful and complete assessment project. Historical information is not currently available in the project area but if provided the project will not duplicate efforts. Since

the project will result in design of projects and not construction, it is unfair to suggest that implementation of construction is unlikely. Enough coordination between the lead entities and BNSF has occurred to make future projects likely. Suggest the POC be removed.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Pierce County
Project Sponsor: King County DNR & Parks
Project Name: Lower Boise Creek Design
Project Number: 04-1467 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The Lower Boise Creek Design project seeks to design a project to restore channel, floodplain, and riparian conditions at the mouth of Boise Creek, a right-bank tributary to the White. Benefits chinook coho, steelhead, and bull trout. The project would design the relocation of the lowest 500 feet of channel into newly constructed channel approximately 1200 feet in length. Adjacent road and railroad constrained channel, but now removed. Uncertain about whether there will be an impact or extent of impact from potential headcutting. 700 feet of additional habitat is good benefit, but not certain that moving creek over new pipe alignment is a good idea in the long term.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Cost of design seems high considering King County owns the property and the project is for design only of a 1500 foot new channel. LE correct to rank this as a low priority. Urgency not demonstrated.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation
Project Sponsor: Fish & Wildlife Dept of
Project Name: Shale Creek Fish Passage Project
Project Number: 04-1498 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? NO
Why?

Great project and cost effective.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW Review comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation
Project Sponsor: Quinault Indian Nation
Project Name: F-15 Road Culverts
Project Number: 04-1704 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

There seems to be a heavy focus on adding rock weirs and riprap. Are these necessary?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The cost estimates for bridges of this size seem very low. Further explanation would be helpful.

4. Other comments.

Please see the WDFW review comments.

It would have been very helpful for the sponsor to provide better information in the application or requested assistance from WDFW to prepare the cost estimates and design options. These are good projects and will provide a high benefit to fish when completed. In the future it is recommended that the sponsor spend more effort to pull together the necessary information.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation
Project Sponsor: Natural Resources Dept of
Project Name: Mule Creek Barrier Replacement Too
Project Number: 04-1702 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

Project is ineligible for SRFB funding.

RCW 75.46.170 (8) was passed into law in 2000, through Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2589, which states:

"The board may award a grant or loan for a salmon recovery project on private or public land when the landowner has a legal obligation under local, state or federal law to perform the project, when expedited action provides a clear benefit to salmon recovery, and there will be harm to salmon recovery if the project is delayed. For purposes of this subsection, a legal obligation does not include a project required solely as a mitigation or condition of permitting. "

This law provided the SRFB with the authority to fund or not fund projects covered under an existing law...such as fish passage, screens, diversions, etc.

In response to the above law, the SRFB on June 15, 2001 and again on December 5, 2003, declared by policy that "silvicultural treatments and other forest practices" means all activities covered by the Forest & Fish Program and the Forest Practices Act, RCW 76.09. What this means is that the SRFB will not fund fish passage projects (culverts) on lands covered by Forest and Fish requirements. Nor will the SRFB pay forest landowners to harvest their trees....pre-commercial and commercial thinning in riparian areas as a means to accelerate the growth of the residual trees.

All fish passage work on all non-Forest & Fish land is addressed in Manual 18e, "In-Stream Passage."

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation
Project Sponsor: Quinault Indian Nation
Project Name: QIN Sediment Del & Fish Passage Assmt
Project Number: 04-1696 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the benefit of the project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

If the project would have focused on inventorying and prioritizing fish passage barriers and followed the guidelines provided in SRFB Manual 18d section 14e WDFW Guidelines Fish Barrier Inventories the project would have been technically sound.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The technical advisors encourage the sponsor to reapply next round and focus the project on completing a comprehensive barrier for the WRIA. The WDFW Technical Applications Program is available to provide assistance and crew training to develop a quality project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation
Project Sponsor: Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition
Project Name: July Creek Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1703 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

Good project and likely a good benefit for fish. However, the application was missing the evaluation proposal. The Barrier Evaluation Forms were useful in understanding the scope of the project

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The sponsor needs to explain in greater detail why \$100K is needed for a bypass bridge?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Quinault Nation
Project Sponsor: Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition
Project Name: Higley Creek Culverts Replacement
Project Number: 04-1710 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Good project and likely high benefit for fish. However, the application was missing the evaluation proposal. The Barrier Evaluation Forms were useful in understanding the scope of the project

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: San Juan Co CD
Project Sponsor: Friends of the San Juans
Project Name: Mud Bay Shoreline Softening
Project Number: 04-1657 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The applicant has addressed all the initial concerns. The project proposal has changed from a restoration project to a feasibility and design project. To maximize the forage fish habitat benefit requires the relocation of the county road and the removal and/or softening of bulkheads along adjacent private property.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: San Juan Co CD
Project Sponsor: Friends of the San Juans
Project Name: Assessment of Eelgrass Restoration
Project Number: 04-1697 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Although this assessment contains a “pilot” restoration component, without fully understanding the reasons for the decline of eelgrass in Wescott Bay, the team feels that a concurrent approach performing both restoration and assessment is a particularly effective proposal in this situation. The project is likely to achieve its stated objectives.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: San Juan Co CD
Project Sponsor: Samish Nation
Project Name: Juvenile Salmon Nearshore Utilization
Project Number: 04-1552 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

It is clear that this project can meet its objectives, and that it is directly relevant to project and strategy development. However, it would be beneficial to discuss how the project would be incorporated into the local habitat recovery strategy to insure certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: SRSC
Project Name: Milltown Island Estuarine Habitat Restoration
Project Number: 04-1620R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?
2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.

The project area is currently influenced by tides, but remnant levee system limits channel development. Removal of additional fill and revegetation on about 212 acres should provide significant benefits to salmon (particularly Chinook) by restoring critical estuarine habitat.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: The Nature Conservancy
Project Name: Fisher Slough Acquisition & Feasibility
Project Number: 04-1624P
Project Location:
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project applicant addressed all initial concerns. This project will serve as an important demonstration project for conducting salmon restoration on diked agricultural land.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: Skagit River System Cooperative
Project Name: McGlinn Island Causeway
Project Number: 04-1625N
Project Location:
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project has a high likelihood of eventually providing important benefits to salmon (particularly Chinook) by restoring access to hundreds if not thousands of acres of critical estuarine habitat. The assessment is necessary to assess the feasibility and design of good restoration projects in this complex area.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: Seattle City Light
Project Name: Hoy Riparian Restoration Project
Project Number: 04-1655C
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The riparian revegetation project and livestock fencing covers 2 miles and 34 acres on the south side of Skagit River and would help to protect the habitat in this area with high use by fall chinook and steelhead for spawning as well as pink and chums. Bank erosion is significant from cattle grazing and vegetation removal, so fencing and replanting should have a high certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: Ducks Unlimited
Project Name: Swinomish Channel Restoration
Project Number: 04-1626R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project will restore 1.5 miles of channel and 200 acres of estuarine marshlands by removing and breaching levees, excavating existing oxbow (to help restore and reconnect old channel) and constructing setback levees. The project has a high likelihood of providing important benefits to salmon (particularly Chinook) by restoring critical estuarine habitat. The proposed work is relatively straightforward and has a high certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: WDFW
Project Name: Rawlins Road Estuary Feasibility
Project Number: 04-1640N
Project Location:
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project will assess the feasibility of restoring critical estuarine habitat involving private landowners. While the certainty of success is unknown since little work has been done with these landowners, the potential benefits are very high. The minimal cost for exploring restoration options and the potentially high rewards make this a worthwhile effort.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.

It’s a great opportunity to pull in landowners who haven’t been engaged in habitat restoration. Project could lead to other opportunities with the agricultural community.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: Skagit Conservation District
Project Name: Cascades Road Erosion Control
Project Number: 04-1638R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project has a high certainty of success in reducing sediment inputs to the Cascade River by upgrading roads to current standards, stabilizing fills, and decommissioning roads. The project would benefit chinook, coho, steelhead, and char in the Cascade River.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: SRSC
Project Name: Gilligan's Island Dike Removal
Project Number: 04-1629R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the "why" box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project applicant has addressed all initial concerns. The project is likely to have a high benefit to salmon by removing 580 feet of dike and restoring natural bank conditions allowing for more natural channel processes in this reach.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: SFEG
Project Name: Skagit Fish Passage Improvement
Project Number: 04-1653R
Project Location:
Project Type: Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project is a combination of habitat inventory, passage design, and implementation of three of the highest priority barriers (potentially including side channels and sloughs). The project is likely to have a high benefit to salmon, although the benefit does depend on which three projects are feasible with the given amount of funding.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.

Filtering the list of 100+ projects down to the 30 highest priorities should be done with minimal effort relying on map information and the professional judgments of local biologists.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit Watershed Council
Project Sponsor: Skagit County Public Works
Project Name: Hansen Creek Design and Permitting
Project Number: 04-1635 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The project has a high cost relative to anticipated benefits, considering the size of the project site. In addition, it is unclear how the assessment will achieve its stated objectives.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Project sponsor needs to provide further justification regarding the \$50,000 consultant services for permitting and \$130,000 consultant services for wetland, alluvial fan, SR 20 crossing and planting plan. The scope of the assessment should be narrowed to develop designs for clearly defined project elements that directly support specific, high priority salmon recovery objectives. In particular, the issue of wetland reconnection on the site and across Highway 20 needs to be more clearly defined.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: SFEG
Project Name: Ennis Creek Acquisition and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1646R
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition and Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project would primarily benefit coho (in a major production area), and possibly steelhead and char as well. The project would reconstruct the historical channel across Innis Ck road for 600 feet into the Samish R within a 50-acre parcel acquired by the Whatcom Land Trust, that includes riparian and floodplain habitat along Samish River. The project is addressing a clear problem with the current channel location along the road and protects the biologically important confluence between Ennis Creek and the Samish River.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.

Some uncertainty exists about the crossing structure but working with Whatcom County to determine what type of road crossing to provide (i.e., bridge, box culvert) and the County would pay entirely for structure.

See additional comments in “04-1646 Ennis WDFW Barrier Evaluation” file.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: SFEG
Project Name: NP Creek Passage Improvement
Project Number: 04-1654R
Project Location:
Project Type: Fish Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The project replaces a bridge and removes concrete apron to improve passage that primarily benefits coho and will open about 1.5 miles of good quality spawning and rearing habitat (PI=16.8). Using rock weirs to address grade differences. This relatively straightforward project has a high certainty of success.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Skagit
Project Sponsor: Skagit Land Trust
Project Name: Wiseman Creek-Minkler Lake Protection
Project Number: 04-1632A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

There currently is no clearly defined proposal for restoring salmon habitat on Parcel No. 1, which makes it difficult to determine whether the stewardship plan is sufficient to meet the goal of salmon habitat restoration. Because of this, the acquisition may be in the wrong sequence.

For Parcel No. 2, existing federal, state, and local wetland protection requirements already protect salmon habitat features of this site, indicating that there is a low threat to habitat conditions if the parcel is not acquired.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Applicant needs to identify a definite habitat restoration plan for Parcel No. 1 and demonstration of specific threats to priority salmon habitat conditions on Parcel No. 2.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project would be strengthened as a combination project, by adding the preferred restoration alternative identified in the final Wiseman Creek Feasibility Study (#00-1735N) to be completed next year.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Walla Walla County of
Project Name: Walla Walla /Spring Branch Hab As
Project Number: 04-1604 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors and made changes to the project to ensure the assessment will lead to beneficial projects in priority areas. The sponsor has outlined the tasks to be implemented, including developing a list of priority habitat restoration actions.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Walla Walla County CD
Project Name: Gose Street Fish Passage Project
Project Number: 04-1605 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Passage

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors .

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Use channel weirs, which have a higher probability of success, anchored into the bed such as concrete, or consider a pool and chute fishway built within the channel to take up the drop. WDFW can lend design assistance if so desired by the project sponsor. The conceptual design at this level should include a stream profile to identify the overall drop. Other alternatives to fish passage should be presented that would better address the certainty of success. The proposal could also be improved by describing other ongoing and proposed restoration activities upstream such as the low-flow channel being discussed by the watershed group.

4. Other comments.

In completing the project, it is important to note the high amount of energy the project will experience just downstream end of the flood control channel.

Passage at Gose Street is a key component in restoring salmonids in the Mill Creek drainage. The project is further supported by numerous partners contributing to the implementation. It is also the 1st in the sequence of projects above the confluence of the Walla Walla River. The project needs to include Ben Tice’s latest report on fish counts at the Bennington Dam to show bull trout, steelhead, and Chinook are actively using Mill Creek for migration in numbers above what was previously suggested.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Walla Walla Co Cons Dist
Project Name: Hofer Dam Fish Passage Project - Phase 1
Project Number: 04-1606 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Sponsor already has a conceptual design completed and is requesting a high dollar amount to take the project to 90% design. Improvements to the diversion dam could lead to significant benefits by addressing a partial barrier to adult and juvenile steelhead, Chinook, and bull trout. It is unclear why this work would not be covered under A&E of Phase 2 construction money and why Phase 1 work to date is insufficient. Project is dependent upon a significant amount of other money (several million dollars) to fix the barrier.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Tri-State Steelheaders Inc
Project Name: Kooskooskie Dam Fish Passage Enhancement
Project Number: 04-1379 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? NO
Why?

The sponsor has addressed the concerns of the SRFB Technical Advisors .

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Removal of the dam (partial or complete) would be the preferred alternative. Dam removal will eliminate height and velocity barriers, increasing the availability of the upper Mill Creek watershed to spawning and rearing by steelhead, bull trout, and spring Chinook. In addition to dam modification, this project will create in-stream habitat and rehabilitate adjacent riparian habitat. It is a partial barrier for adults, as Chinook, steelhead and bull trout have spawned upstream of the dam and probably a full barrier to juveniles.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Pomeroy Conservation Dist
Project Name: Garfield County Irrigation Screening Pro
Project Number: 04-1568 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☐ N ☒
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

This proposal identifies and cost shares for the installation of 30 screens located throughout Garfield County on the Pataha, Deadman, Meadow, and Alpowa Creeks that could benefit threatened summer steelhead. The project is likely to provide benefits but difficult to quantify how significant the benefit will be without more information about the locations of the screens. Provide information and details on prioritization system.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Tri-State Steelheaders Inc
Project Name: N.Fk. Coppei Creek Conservation Easement
Project Number: 04-1539 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

Conservation easement on 80-acre parcel along springs that feed into the North Fork Coppei Creek would indirectly benefit threatened steelhead. Uncertain about imminence of threat from agriculture or development and while this is an important resource to protect, it likely has minimal direct benefit to steelhead as a whole in the Coppei Creek drainage given its long list of other problems. Is there a strategy to protect cold water sources in the Coppei Creek drainage?

It is unclear if this proposal will achieve the goals and objectives because of the uncertainty of future development and land use in this area. There is also concern about including a large amount of uplands as part of the conservation easement and the need to include these should be fully addressed.

While the applicant provided more detail on the threat of land use changes (potential agricultural or residential development), the amount of disturbance from these land use changes is probably minor as it relates to the water temperature of the spring-fed tributary because some vegetation is likely to be maintained in the draw, since it is not an ideal building or farming site. Science does not support the argument that upland vegetation will have much impact on the quantity or quality of water that feeds the groundwater spring. Vegetation could actually remove more groundwater through evapotranspiration. The benefits of shade extend almost exclusively to surface water flow, rather than groundwater flow. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.

Reducing the easement to 150’ on each side improves the cost/benefit ratio, but the benefits of this project to salmon are still questionable. No data was provided on the relative temperatures or discharge of this spring-fed tributary and NF Coppei Creek. More information

is also needed on the amount of habitat and fish use within the spring-fed tributary. The information provided is thus insufficient to determine the benefits of the project to salmonids.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

Could this project proposal be downsized to include only the riparian zone/buffer at an accepted width described for similar sites, i.e. 150' on each side.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

There is no question that conservation easements are important in protecting water quality and habitat. The concern is how much this tributary contributes to the benefit of fish. Those benefits need to be better addressed in the proposal with data such as temperature comparisons between the main channel and this tributary to show cold water influence.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Columbia Conservation Dist
Project Name: Tucannon River Sediment Intrusion Assess
Project Number: 04-1611 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

This is effectively a monitoring program. Monitoring of fine sediment at a snapshot in time provides little useful data to help explain changes or improvements in watershed condition. If erosion reduction measures were undertaken at some distance from priority EDT reaches, it may take decades to see an effect at the downstream reach. I would suggest a sediment budget approach to quantify sediment sources and volumes in the watershed that would help to prioritize future remediation projects.

The applicant is correct to point out that this proposal is not a monitoring project, although that is essentially what would be required to determine if sedimentation is still a significant problem. Since no baseline data exists prior to habitat improvements, current conditions would have to be established and then trends monitored over time. There can be a great deal of variability in fine sediment levels both at a site and reach level. Monitoring fine sediment at only four sites is unlikely to provide statistically meaningful data to defend fine sediment levels above or below the standard of 20 percent. If high levels of fines are discovered, the data is of limited use because the project does not diagnose or document the reason for high sediment levels (i.e., sources of sediment). Wouldn’t field surveys estimating substrate embeddedness provide the same type of information over a larger area? The data developed from this project is unlikely to clearly lead to beneficial projects. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to provide significant benefits to salmonids.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

--

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Blue Mountain Land Trust
Project Name: Assess of Landowner Interest in Cons Eas
Project Number: 04-1617 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

The project proposes to assess landowner interest in conservation easements for the Walla Walla River, Coppei Creek, and Touchet River between Waitsburg and Dayton, with summer steelhead spawning and rearing; and Mill Creek with spring Chinook, steelhead and bull trout and Dry Creek with steelhead. While there is increasing development pressure near the city of Walla Walla, acquisition of easements across this broad area would likely result in piecemeal protections of short reaches. With 90% of the area in private ownership, are easements a realistic strategy for salmonid protection and restoration given the large costs and generally limited public support? A more focused look at unique or particularly productive reaches might be a better approach for protection strategies.

There is no question that conservation easements can be a valuable tool for protecting salmonid habitat, however, the viability of this strategy is still questionable given the many river miles being evaluated and limited funding sources for easements and acquisitions. This type of approach is most effective when many river miles can be protected continuously. What criteria would be used to identify and implement conservation easements in high priority areas? The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project. There appear to be significant constraints to the implementation of high priority projects. A more focused approach would help to remove the project of concern designation.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Asotin County Conservation District
Project Name: Snake River Region Habitat Data Management
Project Number: 04-1613N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital
PROJECT IS INELIGIBLE

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y N ☐ Why?
2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

PROJECT IS INELIGIBLE

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Blue Mountain Land Trust
Project Name: Touchet River Conservation Easement
Project Number: 04-1619 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

No ☒ X

Why?

The proposed project site appears to be decent CREP protected streamside habitat surrounded by farmland along 2 miles of the Lower Touchet used by steelhead and Chinook. The conservation easement will protect the riparian area in perpetuity. The sponsor responded to the Technical Advisor's comments. Most of the protected area is in the floodplain of the Touchet River. The easement will be based on Fair Market Value. The easement will protect the property from development and agricultural use by purchasing the rights for development and agriculture.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snake River
Project Sponsor: Blue Mountain RC&D
Project Name: Ski Bluewood Parking Lot
Project Number: 04-1621 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? Y ☒ N ☐
Why?

The proposed action is to pave the current gravel surfaced Ski Bluewood parking lot, approximately 3.7 acres. This project is unlikely to significantly benefit NF Touchet River bull trout and steelhead. It is unclear that much erosion is occurring from the parking lot, and it seems as though other BMPs could be utilized to minimize sediment delivery without having to pave the entire relatively flat surface. Paving would actually increase runoff into the ditches or swales and potentially create more erosion problems.

The turbidity data is difficult to evaluate without more information on the location of samples, the drainage network from the parking lot to Bluewood Creek, and a complete record of precipitation. It is unfortunate that no data was collected from the NF Touchet below Bluewood Creek. While the drainage from the parking lot does show high turbidity, it is not clear whether this measurement is directly from the parking lot drainage or from Bluewood Creek after the parking lot drainage has mixed with creek discharge. It is also not clear what part of the turbidity is attributable to the parking lot versus the erosion of the sediment from the settling pond. The turbidity in Bluewood Creek is actually highest on September 15th, but no corresponding rainfall data is provided.

While turbidity is a measure of sediment input, turbidity values do not necessarily correlate well with impacts to salmonid habitat. The fine fraction of sediment input flushes through the system rapidly and typically does not directly affect the percentage of fines in spawning gravels. The turbidity value of Bluewood Creek at its confluence with the NF Touchet is not particularly high given the significant storm event and dropped quickly once the rainfall ceased. It seems that equally effective sediment management techniques, such as regrading the

parking lot away from water courses, ditch outs away from water courses to allow sediment infiltration, use of hay bales, etc. could be employed to limit sediment delivery to streams.

While the use of the RUSLE does provide an estimate of erosion, it does not provide an accurate assessment of delivery to Bluewood Ck. The 55 tons of sediment is what is produced by the parking lot, not necessarily what is delivered to the stream. It is unlikely that all of the sediment from the parking lot actually reaches a watercourse.

It's not clear that other options than paving the parking lot were considered for sediment reduction. Cars, as opposed to logging trucks, which travel relatively slowly along a fairly flat surface generate little sediment. Presumably sanding gravel (which may be the largest source of sediment from the parking lot) would still be added during the winter and would be even more subject to transport. A paved parking lot is completely impermeable, while the gravel lot is at least semi-permeable. The project is likely to have limited benefits to salmonids and has a high cost relative to benefits.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Ducks Unlimited - Vancouver
Project Name: Spencer Island Estuary Restoration
Project Number: 04-1585 R
Project Location: Snohomish River Delta
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The new trail spurs may alter how saltwater flows out the system, altering the way tidal channels are formed. A detailed review of the trail spurs seems appropriate.

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Tulalip Tribes
Project Name: Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration Phase 2
Project Number: 04-1587 N
Project Location: Snohomish Delta
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

No

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

See nearshore review comments below.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: King County DNR and Parks
Project Name: Lower Tolt River Floodplain Reconnection
Project Number: 04-1596 R
Project Location: Tolt River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Snohomish County DPW
Project Name: Smith Island Estuary Restoration and Acquisition
Project Number: 04-1572
Project Location: Snohomish Delta
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: King County DNR
Project Name: Raging River Preston Reach Levee Removal
Project Number: 04-1597
Project Location: Raging River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Cascade Land Conservancy
Project Name: Snohomish Confluence Acquisition and Restoration
Project Number: 04-1595 C
Project Location: Snohomish River
Project Type: Acquisition and Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Washington Trout
Project Name: Cherry Creek Floodplain Restoration
Project Number: 04-1574
Project Location: Cherry Creek / Snoqualmie River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

This potentially could be a very worthwhile project for demonstrating that drainage district interests and salmon habitat restoration need not be mutually exclusive.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Tulalip Tribe
Project Name: Alpine Baldy Road Decommissioning
Project Number: 04-1599
Project Location: MBSNF / USFS Roads No.6066 and 6067
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments

The proposal appears sound, however, a more detailed description of the project design and how it will be implemented would be useful. Include such factors as soil conditions, number of culverts to be removed or upgraded, how the mass wasting area will be dealt with, construction BMPs, etc.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Seattle City Light
Project Name: South Fork Tolt LWD Placement
Project Number: 04-1598
Project Location: Tolt River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: NW Chinook Recovery, Inc.
Project Name: Groeneveld Slough Restoration
Project Number: 04-1600
Project Location: Skykomish River
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? No
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

Though this project has been removed from the project of concern list, there are still some design concerns that should be addressed by the sponsor should the project be funded. See below.

- It is not clear that the “porous LWD weir” at the upstream end will meter flows into the slough, or why its desirable to meter flows at all. This technique is usually used with existing active side channels.
- The riprap grade control structures that are intended to back-water low summer flows are probably counter-productive to the natural development of the channel. Grade controls are most appropriate in side channels to maintain a minimum water depth when there is significant groundwater flow. Thus, the proponent should study groundwater/hyporheic flow in the slough before fixing on these grade controls. It may be preferable to leave out the grade controls and just let the slough headcut up from the downstream end to gradually deepen the channel, rather than relying on constructed pools.
- We suspect that the main reason for one of the grade controls is to provide a rock-filled ford for access to the other side. In this case, perhaps a railcar bridge or some other kind of crossing would be more appropriate.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Snohomish Conservation District
Project Name: Riley Slough Restoration Feasibility Study
Project Number: 04-1614N
Project Location: Skykomish River
Project Type: Feasibility Study

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **No**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: WRIA 7 / Snohomish
Project Sponsor: Ducks Unlimited
Project Name: Eagle Perch Wetland Restoration
Project Number:
Project Location: Snoqualmie River
Project Type: Restoration

SPONSOR HAS WITHDRAWN THIS PROJECT

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound.

1. Is this a "project of concern" according to the SRFB's criteria? **Yes**
Why?

It is unclear whether converting this pasture to a wetland has significant benefit to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The plan for fish access and egress from the restoration area needs to be further developed. Despite construction of a new channel in the interior of the site, fish passage from the river remains in a drainage ditch that is shared with other property owners. The plan of allowing the landowner to set the level of the water control structures seems tenuous. We suggest the proponent consider using a roughened channel instead of a pool and weir-type water control structure.

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish
Project Sponsor: Ducks Unlimited
Project Name: Leque Island Estuary Assessment
Project Number: 04-1651R
Project Location:
Project Type: Estuary Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish
Project Sponsor: Stillaguamish Tribe
Project Name: Steelhead Haven Landslide Remediation
Project Number: 04-1634R
Project Location: N. Fork Stillaguamish
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The proponents should be aware that in the opinion of at least one technical advisor, a significant weakness of this project is that it does not correct - but merely responds to – a key landscape process limitation, which is the inability of the river meander to migrate downstream due to bank armoring upstream of the site. A more logical sequencing for habitat restoration in this reach would be to remove the bank armoring and then protect the toe of the landslide. Nevertheless, since the proponents apparently have decided that removal of the bank armoring is politically infeasible and that protection of the toe of the slide is their next best alternative, they should be prepared to make this argument as convincing as possible.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish Lead Entity
Project Sponsor: Stillaguamish Indian Tribe
Project Name: South Fork Riparian Restoration Crew
Project Number: 04-1633R
Project Location:
Project Type: Riparian Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The South Fork Riparian Project is an attempt to provide atleast 50,000 riparian plantings along private and public lands. The objective is to jumpstart recolonization and LWD sources to the river.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish
Project Sponsor: Stillaguamish Indian Tribe
Project Name: Hazel Hole ELJ
Project Number: 04-1642R
Project Location: N.Fork Stillaguamish
Project Type: In-Stream Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish Lead Entity
Project Sponsor: Cascade Land Conservancy
Project Name: Riverscene Park
Project Number: 04-1615C
Project Location: Combination

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The purpose here is to acquire a riverside parcel near Riverscene Park. The area is under heavy development pressure and the existing parcel for sale is in good shape with great understory and mature coniferous trees. A small project component is to plant trees in certain areas. The parcels are currently for sale.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish
Project Sponsor: Stillaguamish Indian Tribe
Project Name: NF Stilly Stream Temperature Reduction
Project Number: 04-1643 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO** Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish Lead Entity
Project Sponsor: Snohomish County SWM
Project Name: Sediment Abatement Assessment
Project Number: 04-1618N
Project Location: Stilly basin
Project Type: Assessment

SPONSOR HAS WITHDRAWN THIS PROJECT

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

More information is needed to determine whether methodology will meet objectives and serve as a basis for future project prioritization. Given the hydrologic characteristics of the river, it would seem difficult to come to conclusions about priority sites when the largest sources of sediment input are still active. It is primarily a sequencing concern.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

With the largest sources of documented concern still active, I question whether this work would be most useful to prioritize other erosion control projects. With the slides active, more information on how the influence of these sources will be isolated from other sediment sources and used to develop a useful priority system would be needed.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The experimental design looks good for the North Fork but the ability to bracket major sediment sources on the South Fork isn’t as clear. The need for the data by restoration practitioners was unclear.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish
Project Sponsor: Snohomish Co Conservation Dist
Project Name: Segelsen Road Erosion Control
Project Number: 04-1644 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish
Project Sponsor: Tulalip Tribe
Project Name: Stillaguamish River Intertidal Enhancement
Project Number: 04-1616R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Thurston County CD
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: WRIA 13 Nearshore Restoration Design Pro
Project Number: 04-1389 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Please see the Nearshore comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Thurston County CD
Project Sponsor: Thurston Regional Plng Council
Project Name: Deschutes River Estuary Rest. Study
Project Number: 04-1439 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO** Why?
2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

The sponsor provided a detailed response that addresses the technical panels

4. Other comments.

The application was very well presented and supporting materials very helpful in understanding the project.

Nearshore comments were generally approving and this proposal represents a biological and physical data collection effort in support of a decision that would determine the future direction of the Deschutes estuary. This is not a construction project and the evaluation should not include discussion of whether construction is likely to occur. The question is whether the restoration study will accomplish its goal given the data provided and the people proposing the work. In both cases it appears the results will be valid and inform the decision making process on this potentially large and beneficial project.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Thurston County CD
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Green Cove Creek Fish Passage Project
Project Number: 04-1386 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

Great project but high cost

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Application and supporting material well presented.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Thurston County CD
Project Sponsor: WA Trout
Project Name: Cooper/Johnson Point Watertype Assess.
Project Number: 04-1453 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

Excellent concept and great proposal. This is the type of assessment work that should be completed in every lead entity area.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Thurston County CD
Project Sponsor: South Puget Sound SEG
Project Name: Adams Creek Fish Passage Project
Project Number: 04-1387 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Whatcom County
Project Sponsor: Whatcom Land Trust
Project Name: South Fork Crown
Project Number: 04-1610 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

This acquisition would protect about 7.75 miles of forested riparian and floodplain habitat for all salmonid species, and in particular critical Chinook spawning habitat. This is in the highest priority reach in the highest priority geographic area with WRIA #1.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Whatcom County
Project Sponsor: Lummi Indian Business Council
Project Name: Upper South Fork Project Development
Project Number: 04-1487 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The project applicant has addresses all concerns. This proposal complements the South Fork Crown project (04-1610A).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Whatcom – WRIA 1
Project Sponsor: Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources
Project Name: NF Nooksack Restoration Feasibility
Project Number: 04-1628N
Project Location: North Fork Nooksack River
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

The proposed assessment of habitat conditions in the North Fork Nooksack River clearly addresses a priority area with critical habitat for Chinook, but the area also has significant channel instability. The assessment would lead to at least one project-ready design for a site. While the reach has a great deal of channel migration that could endanger projects in the long-term, projects will be designed to help protect critical off-channel habitats in the short-term.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Whatcom – WRIA 1
Project Sponsor: Port of Bellingham
Project Name: Squalicum Waterway Restoration
Project Number: 04-1491N
Project Location: Bellingham
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The proposed project is for the design and permitting of redevelopment work along the estuary of Squalicum Creek. The project would provide some positive benefits to the nearshore marine environment, but the relatively small area with significant bank hardening nearby would most likely limit the benefits to fish from the Squalicum Creek system. Given the significant costs of restoration (several million dollars) and the uncertainty about which restoration option will be chosen, the anticipated benefits seem low.

The redevelopment of this area of the Port seems to place significant constraints on whether the most beneficial salmon habitat restoration project will be implemented upon completion of the feasibility.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Whatcom – WRIA 1
Project Sponsor: Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Association
Project Name: Nooksack Fish Passage Improvement
Project Number: 04-1431N
Project Location: Whatcom County
Project Type: Assessment

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO**
Why?

This assessment would help to engineer passage structures for ten of the highest priority stream crossings in the WRIA. The assessment is likely to lead to projects of significant benefit, although it is difficult to quantify the benefits and the benefits are likely to be primarily for coho.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Yakama Nation
Project Name: Holmes Floodplain Property Protection
Project Number: 04-1680 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

This 50 acre, 2400’ side channel acquisition along the Yakima River is addressing a priority limiting factor in a priority area. The surface water right, totaling 3.31 cubic feet per second and 677 acre feet per year will be managed for instream flow restoration upon acquisition.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: MountainStar ConservationTrust
Project Name: Upper Yakima River Easton Reach
Project Number: 04-1679 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The mature riparian forest within this ~23 acre parcel along the Upper Yakima protects a priority habitat in a priority area, and addresses the priority species.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: MountainStar Conservation Trust
Project Name: NF Teanaway River Floodplain - Phase 1
Project Number: 04-1672 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **NO** Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Kittitas Co Conservation Dist
Project Name: YTAHP Lower Reecer Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1675 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the benefit of the project, and it is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objective.

The project objective is to reduce salmon mortality by screening all irrigation water diversions or change points of diversion to preclude the need for a screen and to increase juvenile salmon production areas by removing two full-span diversion structures.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Develop a conceptual design showing what is proposed at the two diversion structures, what the extent of the existing barrier is, stream channel features and specifically how passage for juvenile fish will be provided. A drawing or written conceptual would suffice. An example of information needed is shown in the 5th Round Application Forms 12. In-Stream Passage Projects (stream width, drop, upstream and downstream channel slope, dominant substrate, etc).

Provide conceptual design (written or drawing) of the proposed ring wells. Proximity to the creek and groundwater, size of wells, etc.

Provide more detail in the project cost estimate to break down the costs of the diversion types. Recent information supplied by the project sponsor indicated the ring wells could be constructed as screened/piped diversion with a flow rate less than one cfs. How would this change the project costs?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Meadow Springs Country Club
Project Name: West Fork Amon Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1693 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

While the removal of barriers is a good benefit to primarily coho and steelhead, the costs for the project are high relative to its benefits to fish. The spring fed system probably had limited floodplain historically and proposed dredging of reservoirs will not significantly improve water quality. Runoff from golf course and surrounding urban development appear to be more significant water quality concerns. Overall, this creek system provides a limited quantity and aside from cool water temperatures, provides low quality habitat for salmon.

From a technical perspective this project still provides low benefits for fish. This watershed does not appear to have much habitat, is not a high rated area for restoration because of several limitations in this urban setting, and is probably of limited value as thermal refuge for Yakima River salmonids.

The amount of match is not a criterion we evaluate. While community support is a key criterion for the local citizen’s group, I’m not sure that this project builds community support for salmon restoration in areas that would provide high benefit. Why is this type of public support critical for developing future restoration projects? Is the urban community a priority constituency versus agricultural interests?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Fish & Wildlife Dept of
Project Name: SF Cowiche Creek Protection
Project Number: 04-1691 A
Project Location:
Project Type: Acquisition

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Kittitas Co Conservation Dist
Project Name: YTAHP Wilson Creek Riparian Restoration
Project Number: 04-1676 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The applicant addressed all the initial concerns. This riparian planting technique has been used successfully by the Yakama Nation and reduces the maintenance requirements and increases the certainty of plant survival.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Brunson, Jeff
Project Name: Brunson Wilson Creek Flow & Riparian
Project Number: 04-1690 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

NO

The applicant has addressed all initial concerns. This project should greatly reduce the sediment delivery to Wilson Creek from existing irrigation ditches.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Kittitas Co Conservation Dist
Project Name: YTAHP Project Cherry Creek Fish Passage
Project Number: 04-1673 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the benefit of the project, it is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objective and the project has a high cost relative to the benefits.

The project objective is to reduce salmon mortality by screening all irrigation water diversions or change points of diversion to preclude the need for a screen and to increase juvenile salmon production areas by removing two full-span diversion structures.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

Develop a conceptual design showing what is proposed at the two diversion structures, what the extent of the existing barrier is, stream channel features and specifically how passage for juvenile fish will be provided. A drawing or written conceptual would suffice. An example of information needed is shown in the 5th Round Application Forms 12. In-Stream Passage Projects (stream width, drop, upstream and downstream channel slope, dominant substrate, etc).

Justify the costs for the screen. The costs per cfs for the proposed screen is \$19,000. This is very high when compared to screens built the last 10 years.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: North Yakima Conservation Dist
Project Name: Taylor Ditch Phase I Diversion Structure
Project Number: 04-1682 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

The benefits of this project are limited to the relative cost. The amount of impact from maintenance of the wing dam does not appear to be significant. It’s not clear why this project is a necessary lead to opening Taylor ditch into a functioning side channel?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

The team recommends finalizing plans for restoration of Taylor ditch into side-channel habitat and including these proposed improvements as part of a larger proposal.

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Kennewick Irrigation District
Project Name: Engineered Streams for Salmonid Recovery
Project Number: 04-1685 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?

YES

Why?

This project consists of an engineered stream with construction of a new side channel containing habitat features critical to juvenile salmonids. This is not a significant salmon stream and the project does not appear to provide significant benefits to salmon. The proposal does not work with “natural processes” and it’s not clear sufficient water would be present to support off-channel habitat. The team received very limited information on conceptual design and proposed sites.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

The \$51K budget item for a 10 foot paved trail is not eligible in our restoration program and has been removed from the proposal.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Kennewick City of
Project Name: Lower Amon Creek Culvert Replacement
Project Number: 04-1709 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

The information provided is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of the project. It’s difficult to evaluate the technical aspects of the project without actual photos of the current barrier and specific physical measurements to calculate the value.

This project is a temporary velocity barrier 2-3 days a year, as estimated by the WDFW watershed steward, and has no effect on adult or juvenile migration. This project is not a barrier and should not have been submitted.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Ellensburg Water Company
Project Name: YTAHP Currier Crk/EWC Canal Intersection
Project Number: 04-1678 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

There are multiple downstream barriers limiting the potential for any anadromous species benefits at this site. This project is out of sequence with Project #15 (04-1677, Lower Currier Creek 2 Mile Passage).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: South Naches Irrigation Dist
Project Name: Naches River Flow & Habitat Enhancement
Project Number: 04-1683 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

The location of the project and addressing in-stream flows is good, but a great deal of uncertainty surrounds many aspects of this project. The sequencing of this project, getting permits (Phase 1) prior to developing a conceptual design (Phase 2) seems problematic. There is insufficient information to evaluate the water savings and potential benefits to salmon.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Kittitas Co Conservation Dist
Project Name: Lower Currier Creek 2 Mile Passage
Project Number: 04-1677 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

The location and scale of work seems good, but the lack of information on the project design for the 5 abandoned barrier structures and 2 active diversions are difficult to understand. It's hard to evaluate the true benefit of the whole project.

This project is out of sequence with Project #13 (04-1678, YTAHP Currier Crk/EWC Canal Intersection).

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?
3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?
4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Mid-Columbia RFEG
Project Name: Cle Elum Riparian Restoration, Phase 1
Project Number: 04-1674 N
Project Location:
Project Type: Non-Capital

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria?
Why?

YES

It’s unclear that significant, if any, benefits to bull trout would be achieved from this project. The benefits of this type of project are low to relative costs. It’s not clear how this assessment will lead to restoration projects.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: Ahtanum Irrigation District
Project Name: Bull Trout Protection Shellneck Creek
Project Number: 04-1684 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **INELIGIBLE**
Why?

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is ineligible for SRFB funding. Silvicultural treatments or other forest practices (activities covered by the Forest Practices Act or the Forest and Fish Agreement) are ineligible. (SRFB 5th Round – 2004 Policies and Project Selection Manual #18, page 14)



Individual SRFB Project Review Panel Technical Advisor 5th Round Project Comments Form

Lead Entity: Yakima River Basin
Project Sponsor: North Yakima Conservation Dist
Project Name: YTAHP Stream Habitat Restoration
Project Number: 04-1681 R
Project Location:
Project Type: Restoration

Please refer to Manual 18, Appendix C, for the criteria for projects that are not considered technically sound. In the “why” box explain your reason for selecting this as a project of concern.

Please check the appropriate box.

1. Is this a “project of concern” according to the SRFB’s criteria? **YES**
Why?

It was not clear where habitat plan implementation activities would take place. The team could not evaluate the benefits of this project.

2. If YES, what would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

3. If NO, are there ways in which this project could be further improved?

4. Other comments.

This project is similar to the two SRFB-funded projects that the Yakima County.